

accessing a stub object that is downloaded from a remote location to facilitate access to the remote object; and
accessing the remote object using the stub object.

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated January 31, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 72-77 and 104 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 34, 39-41, 43, 53, 54, 59-61, and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Gaines (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,582); rejected claims 35-38 and 55-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaines in view of Priven et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,327,559); rejected claims 64, 66, 68-71, 73, 75-78, 80, 82-85, 87, 89-92, 94, 96-99, 101, and 103-105 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaines in view of Hill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,197); and rejected claims 65, 67, 72, 74, 79, 81, 86, 88, 93, 95, 100, and 102 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaines in view of Hill et al. and further in view of Priven et al.

In response to the Final Office Action, Applicants filed an Amendment AfterFinal on March 25, 2003, proposing to amend claims 34, 53, 54, 64, 67, 68, 71-75, 77, 78, 82, 85, 89, 92, 96, 99, 103, and 104. The Examiner responded with an Advisory Action indicating that the proposed amendments were not entered. As a result, Applicants have filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) to have the Amendment After-Final entered and considered by the Examiner.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

New Claims 106-114

By this amendment, Applicants have added new claims 106-114. These claims correspond to claims 62-73 of related application Serial No. 10/320,009, filed January 30, 2002, which were canceled during prosecution of that application. Based on the amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the timely allowance of new claims 106-114.

Gaines, Priven et al., and Hill et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, among other things, a stub object/code that is downloaded from a remote location to facilitate access to a remote object, as recited in claims 106-114. In the Final Office Action dated January 31, 2002, the Examiner admits that Gaines does not teach sending a portion of code based on second code obtained from another computing environment (see Final Office Action, page 5, paragraph 8). The Examiner asserts, however, that Hill et al. teaches this recitation. Applicants traverse the Examiner's position that Hill et al. teaches or suggests accessing a "stub object" or "stub code" to facilitate access to a remote object, as recited in claims 106-114.

As explained in the Amendment After-Final filed March 25, 2003, Hill et al. teaches a method for a client machine to access remotely stored data, such as a formula stored in a specific cell of a spreadsheet on a server machine. To do so, the client sends a message to a local spreadsheet proxy, the message including a method name (e.g., GetCell) and a string corresponding to the specific cell (e.g., A1). Hill et al., col. 7, line 64 - col. 8, line 10. The local spreadsheet proxy communicates with a spreadsheet stub on the server machine that eventually returns an address of a remote cell stub and an unmarshal class identifier. Hill et al., col. 8, lines 13-20. The remote

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

cell stub contains a pointer to the cell in the spreadsheet. The unmarshal class identifier is used by the local spreadsheet proxy to create a local cell proxy to communicate with the remote cell stub. Hill et al., col. 8, lines 21-44. Accordingly, this reference cannot teach "downloading stub code or objects from a remote location," as recited in claims 106-114.

Additionally, these references fail to teach or suggest "a remote object reference as the parameter to the remote procedure such that the remote object reference refers to a remote object having a specified type that is a superset of the declared type," as recited in claims 106 and 112. Also, these references fail to teach or suggest "a remote object reference as a return value to a remote procedure," as recited in claims 109 and 114, and a client and server program, as recited in claim 110.

Claims 34-41, 43, 53-61, 64-68, 70-75, 77-82, 84-89, 91-96, and 98-105

As explained in the Amendment After-Final filed March 25, 2003, Gaines, Priven et al., and Hill et al., alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the recitations of claims 34-41, 43, 53-61, 64-68, 70-75, 77-82, 84-89, 91-96, and 98-105. For one reason, the references are directed to distributed systems that pass data between components but not code, as recited in these claims. Further, these references fail to teach or suggest a "stub code," as recited in these claims.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Conclusion

Because Gaines, Priven et al., and Hill et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recitations of claims 34-41, 43, 53-61, 64-68, 70-75, 77-82, 84-89, 91-96, and 98-114, Applicants request the timely allowance of these claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 23, 2003

By: 

Joseph E. Palys
Reg. No. 46,508

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com